



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,148	11/21/2001	Mikael Lagerman	4740-018	2131
24112	7590	11/14/2005	EXAMINER	
COATS & BENNETT, PLLC			LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D	
P O BOX 5			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
RALEIGH, NC 27602			2152	

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/990,148	Applicant(s) LAGERMAN, MIKAEL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Victor Lesniewski	2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 8/24/2005 has been placed of record in the file.
2. Claim 5-10 and 19-23 have been amended.
3. The objection to the claims is withdrawn in view of the amendment.
4. The rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 is withdrawn in view of the amendment.
5. Claims 1-30 are now pending.
6. The applicant's arguments, see page 8 of the amendment filed 8/24/2005, with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 19-21, 23, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. In turn, the rejection of claims 2, 3, 6, 8-10, 13-18, 22, and 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103 has also been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new grounds of rejection is made as described in detail below.

Claim Objections

7. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Claim 10 makes claim to "the method of claim 10." However the claim cannot depend on itself. For the purpose of applying prior art it will be assumed that claim 10 refers to the method of claim 9.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamner et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,796,951), hereinafter referred to as Hamner, in view of Draper et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,192,365), hereinafter referred to as Draper.

10. Hamner disclosed a method for managing a computer network wherein a database stores real-time and historical network information for monitored network devices. In an analogous art, Draper disclosed a transaction log for updating objects in a database with other versions of the database objects.

11. Concerning the independent claims, Hamner did not explicitly state the historical configuration data as a collection of changed objects. Although, Hamner does state storing historical configuration data representing past configurations of a network in the same database with the current configuration data, he is silent on exactly how the historical configuration data is stored and managed. However, storing historical configuration data in a database as a collection of changed objects was well known in the art as evidenced by Draper's system which uses update objects in a log database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Hamner by adding the ability to store historical configuration data as a collection of changed objects, wherein each changed object represents a past configuration of one of said managed objects that has been changed as

provided by Draper. Here the combination satisfies the need for a more effective transaction log for a network system that also supports a variety of database objects. See Draper, column 2, lines 23-44. This rationale also applies to those dependent claims utilizing the same combination.

12. Some claims will be discussed together. Those claims which are essentially the same except that they set forth the claimed invention as a database or a communication network are rejected under the same rationale applied to the described claim.

13. Thereby, the combination of Hamner and Draper discloses:

- <Claims 1, 11, 19, and 23>

A method of maintaining network configuration data in a database, said method comprising: storing current configuration data representing a current configuration of said network in a database as a collection of managed objects, wherein each managed object has attributes corresponding to variables that can be configured to manage and control operation of the network (Hamner, column 7, lines 44-60 and figure 5); and storing historical configuration data representing past configurations of said network in said database (Hamner, column 7, lines 48-51) as a collection of changed objects, wherein each changed object represents a past configuration of one of said managed objects that has been changed (Draper, column 3, lines 1-15 and column 36, lines 39-48).

Claim 19 also includes limitations discussed in relation to claim 4 below.

- <Claims 2, 13, and 25>

The method of claim 1, further comprising restoring said database to a prior version by restoring historical configuration data from at least one changed object (Draper, column 3, lines 16-25).

- <Claims 3, 14, and 26>

The method of claim 1 further comprising altering said database by selectively restoring historical configuration data from one or more changed objects (Draper, column 3, lines 16-25).

- <Claims 4, 12, and 24>

The method of claim 1 further comprising storing, contemporaneously with storing said historical configuration data, change parameters associated with the change (Draper, column 3, lines 21-25).

- <Claims 5 and 20>

The method of claim 4 wherein said change parameters include a timestamp (Draper, column 3, lines 21-25).

- <Claim 6>

The method of claim 5, wherein said historical configuration data to be stored into said database is selected based on said timestamp (Draper, column 41, lines 5-8).

- <Claims 7 and 21>

The method of claim 4 wherein said change parameters include an operator identification (Draper, column 29, lines 29-49).

- <Claim 8>

The method of claim 7, wherein said historical configuration data to be stored into said database is selected based on said operator identification (Draper, column 23, lines 30-33).

- <Claims 9 and 22>

The method of claim 4 wherein said change parameters include a group code (Draper, column 12, lines 39-45).

- <Claim 10>

The method of claim 10, wherein said historical configuration data to be stored into said database is selected based on said group code (Draper, column 18, lines 47-59).

- <Claims 15 and 27>

The database of claim 12 further comprising prospective configuration data stored as one or more changed objects representing proposed changes to one or more managed objects (Draper, column 36, lines 11-23).

- <Claims 16 and 28>

The database of claim 15, wherein said database is altered by selectively substituting prospective configuration data associated with one or more said changed objects for the associated current configuration data (Draper, column 36, lines 34-48).

- <Claims 17 and 29>

The database of claim 15, wherein said database includes both said historical configuration data and said prospective configuration data (Draper, column 37, lines 24-30).

- <Claims 18 and 30>

The database of claim 17, wherein said database is altered by selectively substituting prospective configuration data associated with one or more said changed objects for the associated current configuration data, and selectively substituting historical configuration data associated with one or more other of said changed objects for the associated current configuration data (Draper, column 36, lines 49-67).

Since the combination of Hamner and Draper discloses all of the above limitations, claims 1-30 are rejected.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure.

- MacLeod et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,343,295) disclosed a system for tracking the lineage of data in a database.
- Rochford et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,654,803) disclosed a graphical user interface for displaying historical and current performance information for a route in a communications network.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor Lesniewski whose telephone number is 571-272-3987.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Victor Lesniewski
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2152


BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
PRIMARY EXAMINER